DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 751 SP 036 487

AUTHOR	Melnick, Susan L.; Zeichner, Kenneth M.
TITLE	Teacher Education for Cultural Diversity: Enhancing the Capacity of Teacher Education Institutions To Address Diversity Issues.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, East Lansing, MI.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	NCRTL-RR-95-4
PUB DATE	Oct 95
NOTE	27p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034 ($6.08).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Cultural Differences; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Minority Group Teachers; *Multicultural Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Standards; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Diversity (Student); Ethnic Differences; *National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

This document reports on portions of a study on "Teacher Education for Diversity" in progress since 1990. The overall study includes an ongoing analysis of relevant literature, which has generated a conceptual framework describing the range of existing positions on teacher education for cultural diversity. The study includes the development of three case studies of exemplary programs employing different organizational arrangements and instructional strategies that contravene or compensate for the cultural insularity of teacher education faculty. The specific concern reported in this paper has been to understand the variety of arrangements and strategies currently being used to prepare a predominantly white, monolingual student teaching force to teach poor students of color who have historically been unserved, ill-served, or inappropriately served by traditional teaching practices. Findings of the study are summarized in relation to three dimensions: (1) the problem of selection; (2) the problem of socialization through curriculum and instruction; and (3) the problem of changing the institutional environment of teacher education. Strategies to address these problems include case studies, field experiences, recruitment of minority faculty, staff development for teacher education faculty, and partnerships with colleges or universities and school districts with significant numbers of minority students and faculty. Preliminary findings from the study suggest that although the faculty in the case studies examined can demonstrate immediate influence of their efforts through prospective teachers' self-reports, there is no convincing evidence in the literature related to long-term impact of these strategies on teachers and their practices or on teacher education institutions and their faculties. (Contains 48 references.) (ND)

$6.08

ED 392 751

Research Report 95-4

Teacher Education for Cultural Diversity: Enhancing the Capacity of Teacher Education Institutions to Address Diversity Issues

Susan L. Melnick
Michigan State University

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin—Madison

NCRTL

National
Center for Research
on Teacher Learning

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sponsored by the United States Department of Education
Office of Education Research and Improvement

SP036487

Research Report 95-4

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY: ENHANCING THE CAPACITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY ISSUES

Susan L. Melnick
Michigan State University

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin—Madison

Published by

National Center for Research on Teacher Learning
116 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

October 1995

This work is sponsored in part by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, College of Education, Michigan State University. The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this chapter do not necessarily represent the position, policy or endorsement of the Office or the Department.

A revised version of a paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL, February, 1994.

© 1995 by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON TEACHER LEARNING

The National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (NCRTL)[1] was founded at Michigan State University in 1985 with a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education.

The NCRTL is committed to research that will contribute to the improvement of teacher education and teacher learning. To further its mission, the NCRTL publishes research reports, issue papers, technical series, conference proceedings, craft papers and special reports on contemporary issues in teacher education. For more information about the NCRTL or to be placed on its mailing list, please write to the Publications Clerk, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 116 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Directors: Robert E. Floden, G. Williamson McDiarmid

Study Directors: Linda Anderson, Deborah Ball, Daniel Chazan, Helen Featherstone, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, Mary Kennedy, G. W. McDiarmid, Kenneth Zeichner

Many papers published by the NCRTL are based on the Teacher Education and Learning to Teach (TELT) study, a single, multisite longitudinal study. The researchers who have contributed to this study are listed below:

Marianne Amarel
Deborah Loewenberg Ball
Joyce Cain
Sandra Callis
Barbara Camilleri
Anne Chang
David K. Cohen
Ada Beth Cutler
Sharon Feiman-Nemser
Mary L. Gomez
Samgeun K. Kwon
Magdalene Lampert
Perry Lanier
Glenda Lappan
Sarah McCarthey
James Mead
Susan Melnick
Monica Mitchell
Harold Morgan
James Mosenthal
Gary Natriello
Barbara Neufeld
Lynn Paine
Michelle Parker
Richard Prawat
Pamela Schram
Trish Stoddart
M. Teresa Tatto
Sandra Wilcox
Suzanne Wilson
Lauren Young
Kenneth M. Zeichner
Karen K. Zumwalt

---

[1]Formerly known as the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (1985-1990), the Center was renamed in 1991.

TEACHER EDUCATION FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY: ENHANCING THE CAPACITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY ISSUES

Susan L. Melnick
Kenneth M. Zeichner

INTRODUCTION

The matter of educating an increasingly diverse primary and secondary student population in public schools in the United States has assumed a position of critical importance. As educators and policy makers look forward to the 21st century, demographic projections suggest that, in the coming years, this goal will be complicated further by the fact that students will be increasingly different in background from one another and from their teachers, and many more students will be poor. The problem of preparing teachers to educate a diverse student body has been a major concern in the United States since the 1960s (Smith 1969). Despite policy initiatives to recruit teacher candidates who are representative of the backgrounds and life experiences of diverse students, it is likely that most new teachers will continue to be Caucasian, monolingual speakers of English with backgrounds and life experiences vastly different from the students they will be expected to teach (Banks 1991).

Most teacher education programs acknowledge in principle the importance of pluralistic preparation of teachers. In practice, however, most teacher education programs actually represent what John Goodlad (1990) has called a monocultural approach (see also Grant 1993). In their failure to adequately prepare their graduates for diversity, such programs perpetuate traditional teaching practices which have largely failed to provide quality instruction for poor and ethnic and linguistic-minority students. Teacher candidates may come to teacher education with limited interracial and intercultural experience, erroneous assumptions about diverse youngsters, and limited expectations for the success of all learners (Zeichner 1993); it is the responsibility of teacher educators to adequately address these shortcomings.

While this is not an easy task in itself, there is a related problem. Many teacher educators themselves are limited in cross-cultural experiences and understandings—they are overwhelmingly Caucasian and monolingual and culturally encapsulated (Ducharme and Agne 1989). These circumstances make the task of educating teachers for diversity even more difficult to achieve in most settings because of widespread agreement about the importance of a culturally diverse learning community and institutional support for diversity, to enable teacher education programs to promote an appreciation for diversity and equity among prospective teachers (Hixson 1992). **Although the vast inequities in U. S. society cannot be attributed to the failure of schools, the failure of schools to provide quality education for all students represents a crisis in education that is intolerable in a democratic society.** The need for teacher education in the U. S. to adequately prepare teachers for diversity has never before been more critical than it is now, as the current review of NCATE's Professional Accreditation Standards clearly attests.

NCATE'S PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS: A TEMPLATE FOR ASSESSING THE CAPACITY OF INSTITUTIONS TO ADDRESS DIVERSITY ISSUES

In response to the Constitutional provision for continuous review of the Professional Accreditation Standards (Article IX), the Standards Committee of the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE undertook a review of the 1987 standards. This 1992 review resulted in several refinements to the existing standards, and the results were circulated for reactions and recommendations during the latter part of 1993. As described in the "Memorandum on the Draft of the Refinements" by NCATE President Arthur Wise (1993), the Standards Committee paid careful attention to two characteristics of the Standards and Indicators of Quality relevant to our concerns about preparing teachers to teach culturally diverse learners: the interweaving of "the place of conscience or moral dimensions of teaching" (p. 2) into some of the standards and indicators and the "infusion of attention to multicultural and diversity issues across all standards" (p. 3).

EXAMPLES OF THE PROPOSED NCATE STANDARDS
RELATED TO PREPARING TEACHERS FOR CULTURAL DIVERSITY

Design of the Curriculum

Courses and experiences in professional studies incorporate multicultural and global perspectives.

The integrative studies enable candidates to develop meaningful learning experiences for students within the context of students' cultures, language backgrounds, socioeconomic studies, communities, and families.

Quality of Instruction

Instruction reflects knowledge about multicultural education, cultural context, exceptionalities, curriculum design, instruction, and evaluation.

Faculty Qualifications

Faculty have developed multicultural competencies through formal study or experiences in culturally diverse settings.

Faculty Composition

The unit ensures that the professional education faculty represent cultural diversity.

Figure 1

The draft document entitled "Proposed Refinement of NCATE's Standards for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units" indicates that the Committee's goal was threefold: (1) to reduce duplication across standards, (2) clarify language, and (3) reorganize the standards to emphasize importance (p. 1). In accomplishing these goals, the Committee rewrote existing indicators and generated new ones which clearly specify a template for addressing issues of diversity. As selectively illustrated in Figure 1, these revisions or additions concern most of the Standards, thereby making attention to diversity explicit where it was heretofore, at best, implicit. They include explicit references to the design and content of the teacher education curriculum, the quality of instruction for teacher candidates, collaborative relationships within the professional

community, the composition of the faculty and teacher candidate body, faculty qualifications, and governance and accountability of the unit responsible for preparing teachers.

While we agree with the intent and thrust of the Standards Committee's efforts to make multicultural education a more central concern in all teacher education programs, **our ongoing research on Preparing Teachers for Diversity sponsored by the National Center for Research on Teacher Learning (NCRTL) suggests both possibilities and problems for institutional responses to the refined NCATE standards and indicators.**

The NCRTL Study

This document reports on portions of a study on "Teacher Education for Diversity" which we have been conducting since 1990. The overall study includes an ongoing analysis of relevant literature, which has generated a conceptual framework describing the range of existing positions on teacher education for cultural diversity, and the development of three case studies of exemplary programs which employ different organizational arrangements and instructional strategies that contravene or compensate for the cultural insularity of teacher education faculty, characteristic of most of the 1,200 institutions which prepare teachers in the United States. Although an adequate definition of "diversity" needs to be broad and inclusive with attention to such other areas as gender, age, religion, exceptionalities, sexual preference, etc., the use of the term "cultural diversity" in this study refers primarily to differences related to social class, race, ethnicity, and language.

The specific concern in our study has been to understand the variety of arrangements and strategies currently being used to prepare a predominantly white, monolingual student teaching force to teach poor students of color who have historically been unserved, ill-served, or inappropriately served by traditional teaching practices[1]. Despite the rhetoric surrounding multicultural education and diversity in recent years and the attempts of groups like NCATE to force teacher educators to pay more serious attention to the issues, there are, in actuality, few programs which substantively address these concerns. For example, according to Gollnick (1992), of the first 59 institutions which sought national accreditation for their teacher education programs under the 1987

standards, only eight (13.6%) were in full compliance with the minimum multicultural education requirements for teacher education programs.

Although most institutions included references to multicultural education in the unit's objectives or mission statement, NCATE evaluators were often unable to detect where these were implemented in the curriculum (Gollnick 1992, p. 236).

Much of the literature on efforts to educate teachers for cultural diversity is fugitive, and some of the good work that is going on has received little public attention beyond program sites. **Our purpose in the overall study is to make some of these exemplary practices more visible, to capture the voices of teacher educators who take matters of diversity seriously in their attempts to educate preservice teachers, and to encourage more thorough and widespread attention to issues of diversity in initial teacher education programs throughout the United States.**

Over the course of our study, we have come to regard the problem of teacher education for diversity as one having three dimensions: (1) the problem of selection, (2) the problem of socialization through curriculum and instruction, and (3) the problem of changing the institutional environment of teacher education. We will briefly summarize our initial findings related to each of these three dimensions. Special attention will be given to the problem of institutional change in relation to the proposed NCATE refinements.

The Problem of Selection

Much has been written in the U. S. about the growing disparity in backgrounds and life experiences between teachers and teacher educators, on the one hand, and public school students, on the other. It is clear from our work, as both researchers and teacher educators, as well as the work of others that most prospective teachers come to teacher education with very little direct intercultural experience. In addition, they tend to view diversity as a problem rather than as a resource. They possess little knowledge about different ethnic and racial groups in the United States and their cultures, histories, and contributions to the making of the nation, and especially their records of discrimination, disenfranchisement, and suffering. Further, most teacher candidates want to teach students like themselves and are not even convinced that all students are capable of

learning (Gomez, in press; Goodlad 1990; Paine 1989; Zimpher and Ashburn 1992). While it may be possible to remedy these factors to some extent, most teacher education programs as they are currently organized fail to do so. The literature on teacher learning overwhelming suggests that, even under the best of circumstances, teacher education is a weak intervention (Zeichner and Gore 1990). Some researchers, like Martin Haberman at the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee, have argued that typical teacher education students who are young and culturally encapsulated are not developmentally ready to make the kinds of adjustments needed for successful cross-cultural teaching. These researchers are pessimistic about the likelihood that preservice teacher education can become a powerful enough intervention to change the attitudes and dispositi devel-oped over a lifetime that teacher education students bring to teacher education (Haberman 1991).

We clearly need to modify programs to deal with teacher education students' shortcomings, as NCATE's proposed refinements related to curriculum design and content, student body composition, faculty composition and qualifications, and candidate progress issues suggest. But it is becoming progressively clear that some selection screens, such as the interviews developed by Haberman (1987) to screen candidates for teaching in urban schools, must also be used to determine potential abilities to be successful cross-cultural teachers. It is clear that instead of depending solely on grade point averages, test scores, and glowing testimony of young college students wanting to be teachers because they love children, **we have to find ways**, as Haberman says, **to focus more on picking the right people rather than on changing the wrong ones**.

In one of the programs we are studying, The American Indian Cultural Immersion Project, students are required to undergo a systematic year-long period of cultural study before entry to the program. During this period of time prior to student teaching, students attend regular meetings where, under the guidance of program staff, they read and study about various American Indian groups , their histories, and lifestyles; read American Indian literature; interact with American Indian consultants; etc. It is argued by teacher educators in this program that this kind of systematic preadmission orientation program screens out people who are not serious about the cultural diversity aspects of the program.

The Problem of Socialization Through Curriculum and Instruction

Most of our research has centered on the identification of curricular and instructional strategies teacher educators have used to attempt to prepare preservice teachers to teach diverse students. Our literature reviews suggest that these strategies are generally organized in two ways: either (1) through the **infusion** approach, which integrates attention to diversity throughout the program's various courses and field experiences, or (2) through the **segregated** approach, which treats diversity as the focus of a single course or as a topic in a few courses while other components of the program remain untouched. While studies indicate a clear preference for the infusion approach, not surprisingly, the segregated approach dominates (Gay 1986).

Our analyses of the literature have also identified a tension in the field between **culture-specific** approaches which seek to prepare teachers to teach specific cultural groups in particular contexts (e.g., urban Puerto Rican students) and **culture-general** approaches which seek to prepare teachers to be successful in any context that involves cross-cultural interactions. The latter approach focuses on identifying and understanding general cognitive processes that mediate cross-cultural interactions and emphasizes experiences that people are likely to have during cross-cultural encounters. According to Kushner and Brislin (1986), teachers who experience a culture-general emphasis in their preparation programs:

> would be expected to be more knowledgeable about factors that contribute to cross-cultural misunderstanding, be sensitive to such factors when interacting with students and parents and be able to approach potentially conflicting situations with an awareness and ability to ask questions in such a way that takes culturally determined factors into account (p. 54).

The community-specific and community-controlled approach to teacher education advocated in 1976 by a U.S. Office of Education Commission on Teacher Education (Study Commission 1976) is an example of the culture-specific approach which seeks to prepare teachers to be culturally sensitive and interculturally competent teachers with regard to specific groups of students. Here specific communities of people develop teacher education experiences which are designed specifically for their own schools and communities. This kind of culture-specific preparation for teaching specific groups of

students in particular contexts (e.g., Navajos) may help develop sensitivities and capabilities among teachers that are useful in other cross-cultural contexts (see Willison 1994). The emphasis is on the particular contexts into which they are being inducted. All teacher education for diversity efforts can be analyzed in terms of the degree to which they emphasize culture-general and culture-specific approaches.

Another dimension in which teacher education for diversity efforts vary is the degree to which they emphasize **interacting with cultures** as opposed to **studying about cultures**. All programs which seek to prepare teachers to teach diverse students probably include at least some direct field experience. In diverse schools and/or communities, programs vary as to how much they emphasize these direct experiences and according to the degree to which they put their students into contact with students and adults from different cultural backgrounds.

Self-Knowledge. Our research suggests a wide range of curricular and instructional strategies are used within these various dimensions. They attempt to socialize prospective teachers to see themselves as members of a culturally diverse society and to value cultures other than their own. Strategies include the use of autobiography, biography, and life history methods to help students understand their own cultural identities, and intellectually focused and socially supportive strategies of collaborative reflection such as "story telling" to help them reexamine their attitudes, assumptions, expectations, and beliefs about ethnic, racial, and language groups different from their own (see Zeichner 1993).

Examples of this approach of helping teacher education students locate themselves within our culturally diverse society and examine their attitudes toward others include the work of King and Ladson-Billings (1990) at the University of Santa Clara, the work of Hollins (1990) at California State University—Hayward, the work of Gomez and Tabachnick (1991) at the University of Wisconsin—Madison, the work of Jim Banks at the University of Washington (1991), and the Teachers for Alaska program (Noordhoff and Kleinfeld 1993).

Much of the data from our literature reviews and case studies suggest that under some circumstances, these strategies have a positive and immediate impact on

prospective teachers' attitudes and dispositions. However, **there is some evidence in the literature to suggest that students often resist teacher educators' efforts to change their views** (Ahlquist 1992). At times, teacher education practices designed to combat negative stereotypes actually reinforce teacher candidates' prejudices and misconceptions about diverse students (Haberman and Post 1992).

Cultural Knowledge. Another set of strategies is designed to provide students with cultural and historical knowledge to overcome what Ellwood (1990) has called their cultural ignorance of groups different from their own. We are studying Indiana University's American Indian Cultural Immersion Project which prepares students to student teach on the Navajo reservation in the southwestern U. S. Strategies used in this program include helping prospective teachers gain knowledge about both the common elements and the rich diversity within the history and culture of the Navajo people through literature, film, poetry, art work, and discussions with Navajo people. During the cultural preparation that precedes the student-teaching semester, various people from the Navajo reservation are hired by the program and come to Indiana for brief periods of time to introduce prospective teachers to various and diverse aspects of contemporary Navajo life. During a recent orientation workshop, these cultural experts included a Navajo poet who read and discussed her work with the student teachers and a dormitory aide who taught the students basic Navajo words and discussed issues related to culturally appropriate and inappropriate behavior on the reservation. Cultural knowledge strategies are also used in our other two case study sites. At the University of Alaska—Fairbanks, the focus is on preparing students to work primarily with Alaskan Native students in rural villages and in urban multicultural schools. In the Urban Education Program of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the focus is on preparing students to work in urban schools serving the many different ethnocultural communities in the city of Chicago.

In all three programs, carefully structured and monitored cultural immersion experiences in communities allow students to experience first hand the cultures they are learning about and to subsequently analyze their experiences. In two of our three case study sites (Teachers for Alaska and the American Indian Project), prospective teachers

live for a semester in the communities in which they teach. Students in the Chicago program all live together in a multiracial and economically diverse northside community and participate in structured activities which take them into many of the city's ethnic neighborhoods. An important part of these immersion experiences is the use of community people as cultural experts (Mahan 1993). In the American Indian project, Navajo dormitory aides, with whom student teachers live, help the prospective teachers make friends in the community and participate in many community activities such as chapter house meetings, pow-wows, rodeos, etc. (Willison 1994). In the Chicago program, community members are hired as program consultants to introduce teachers to various community resources such as the Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum, the People's Music School, and the Puerto Rican Cultural Center. They also introduce them to various perspectives, such as what it is like to live on public assistance (Russell and Iazetto 1994). In the Alaska program, elders in the village of Minto have been hired to introduce prospective teachers to traditional lifestyle patterns in Native Alaskan communities (Ongtooguk 1994). In other cases the involvement of prospective teachers with community members is more informal. For example, student teachers in the Alaska program are encouraged during a one week "dunking" experience in an Athabascan community which precedes student teaching to:

> put themselves in roles outside of the classrooms (e.g., community basketball, skin sewing or beading groups, church attendance) and to spend time in such places as the store and post office where people are likely to congregate or share news. We advise our students to seek out the expertise of teacher's aides who live in the community and to make home visits . . . (Noordhoff and Kleinfeld 1993).

While relatively brief community experiences (e.g., day-long bus tours through inner city areas) are a common strategy in U. S. teacher education programs, they risk being superficial experiences which create what Harry Broudy once called "interested tolerance" at best and reinforcement of existing stereotypes at worst. **The most effective community experiences are sustained efforts to help prospective teachers learn how to interact in more authentic ways with parents and other adults from different racial and ethnic backgrounds.**

To avoid stereotypic responses to different cultural groups, some programs, including two of our case study sites (Teachers for Alaska and the American Indian Project), help prospective teachers learn how to learn about, and subsequently incorporate into their practice, information about their own students, their families, and communities as a starting point for teaching and learning (e.g., Mahan, Fortney, and Garcia 1983; Noordhoff and Kleinfeld 1993). Both of these programs require a series of activities through which student teachers learn about the communities in which they are teaching (e.g., identifying cultural norms) and think about the implications of this cultural knowledge for teaching their pupils. In the American Indian Project, the community activities and analysis of community norms and classroom implications continues throughout the student teaching experience and is closely monitored by program staff through a journal that students send back to Indiana. In Alaska, while student teachers live in their school communities, the structured community activities mainly precede the student teaching semester. In the Urban Education Program, there is also very little emphasis on community experiences during student teaching. Here, as in the Teachers for Alaska program, most of the structured community experiences precede student teaching.

Case-Based Instruction. Another instructional strategy that is used to prepare teachers for cultural diversity is case-based teaching. In one of our program sites, the University of Alaska—Fairbanks (Kleinfeld 1989) as well as at the Far West Laboratory in San Francisco with the "Case Methods in Multicultural Education Project" (Shulman 1992; Shulman and Mesa-Bains 1990; Gallagher 1993), teacher educators are using case studies, illustrating the challenges of teaching diverse students, to prepare more culturally sensitive and interculturally competent teachers.

Teacher educators have argued that cases are uniquely suited to the analysis of the complex and emotionally charged issues of teaching in culturally unfamiliar contexts. **It is felt that cases can help prospective teachers develop a social map of a cultural terrain and interpret the social meaning of unfamiliar cultural events** (Kleinfeld 1989).

> Cases allow teachers to discuss race and class issues openly, reflect on previously held views about different cultures, and confront their own potential prejudices and stereotypes... The case approach can also provide a mechanism that enables both majority and minority teachers to talk together, through the distance of the case, about issues that might be too difficult to discuss openly (Shulman and Mesa-Bains 1990, p. 4)

Shulman (1992) points out, however, that cases, like other instructional strategies used to prepare teachers for cultural diversity, do not, by themselves, lead to greater cultural sensitivity and intercultural competence. The cultural sensitivity of the teacher educators using the strategies is critical.

> Cases, even with commentaries, do not teach themselves. Discussion leaders must not only be sensitive to the issues represented in the cases but also acutely aware of their own biases and intercultural blindness. They must understand the problems portrayed from multiple perspectives. And they must be able to anticipate in detail the variety of responses each case evokes, both emotionally and intellectually (pp. 21-22).

Field Experiences. Perhaps the most common strategy used to prepare teachers for diversity is a field experience in schools serving ethnic- and/or language-minority students. Many programs and states like California now require all teacher education students to experience a variety of culturally different schools prior to certification (e.g., Ross, Johnson, and Smith 1991). Other efforts combine both the school and community immersion experience and require student teachers to spend some time in communities during their practicums and student teaching. But merely requiring the school experience, the community experience, or both, does not necessarily insure that students will develop the cultural sensitivity and intercultural competence needed for teaching diverse learners. Our work and that of others has shown that careful preparation for the field experiences, as in the year-long cultural training in the American Indian project, careful monitoring of the experience while students are in the field and opportunities to reflect about and analyze the experiences are important. It has also been argued that it is important for those who supervise these experiences to have had successful teaching experience in the kinds of communities in which student teachers are working (see Zeichner and Hoeft, in press).

Teacher Education for Diversity and Teacher Learning

In general, the empirical evidence regarding the success of these various strategies in helping to prepare prospective teachers to teach diverse students is very weak. At best, some teacher educators such as Etta Hollins (1990), Joyce King and Gloria Ladson-Billings (1990), and Lanny Beyer (1991) have been able to demonstrate some immediate influence of one or more of these strategies through the presentation of student teacher self-reports. These studies clearly show that under certain conditions, teacher education programs are able to help prospective teachers reexamine both themselves and their attitudes toward others and to gain knowledge about various cultural groups in the United States that had been excluded from their own education. For the most part, however, the literature is filled with assertions about the value of particular practices which are not substantiated by empirical evidence (Grant and Secada 1990). In no case have we been able to find in the literature convincing evidence related to the long-term impact of these strategies on teachers and their teaching practices. Our case study design includes interviews with graduates of each of the programs we are studying. Through these interviews, we hope to be able to provide some insights into the question of the long-term impact of particular strategies to educate teachers for diversity.

Ultimately, we need to better understand how to prepare teachers for diversity in ways that are connected to active and successful efforts by teachers to promote greater equity and social justice in schools. Changing the oftentimes negative attitudes and low expectations that teachers often hold for ethnic and language minority students and overcoming teachers' cultural ignornance are only first steps in dealing with the serious problems of inequity that we face in American public education.

The Problem of the Institutional Environment

The foregoing examples of selection and socialization strategies show some promise despite limited empirical evidence of long-term impact on teachers and their practices. The fundamental problem is that, in using these potentially effective strategies, teacher educators often define the task of teacher education for diversity only as one of socialization and have ignored the selection and institutional aspects of the problem. The

institutional environment in which a teacher education program is embedded is critical in determining the success of curriculum and instructional strategies.

Despite the rhetoric to the contrary, efforts to reform U.S. teacher education to address cultural diversity are severely hampered by the cultural insularity of most of the education professorate and by the lack of commitment to cultural diversity in teacher education institutions (Grant 1993).

There is an old adage—teachers teach what they know—and so do teacher educators. The correlate is that we can't teach what we don't know. **Teacher education for diversity involves** much more than the transfer of information from teacher educators to their students. It involves **the profound transformation of people and of the world views and assumptions that they have carried with them for their entire lives**. As Nieto (1992) says, an important part of becoming a multicultural teacher is becoming a multicultural person. This kind of transformation is beyond the current capabilities of most faculties of teacher education in the United States, and NCATE's proposed refinements related to faculty composition and qualifications in particular further highlight the problems.

In addition to the limitations posed by the cultural insularity of teacher education faculty, there is also a general lack of broad institutional commitment to diversity in teacher education programs at the college and university level. The degree of institutional commitment to diversity is evidenced in such things as hiring practices, student recruitment and admission policies, and curricular programs. Making issues of diversity central to the intellectual life of a college or university community legitimizes efforts to educate teachers for diversity.

> The success of any teacher education program in restructuring for diversity is largely influenced by the norms and processes of the host institution. Teacher education programs found in institutions actively committed to the inclusion of people from diverse backgrounds are more likely to succeed in addressing issues of diversity than those located in institutions that are insensitive to or silent on matters of cultural inclusion (Villegas 1993, p. 3)

In our research, we have uncovered four different approaches to dealing with the institutional aspects of teacher education for diversity and the current limitations of most

teacher educators to prepare teacher candidates to work with diverse students. The first is the **active recruitment of faculty of color** through the establishment of new institutional policies and programs like the "Madison Plan" at the University of Wisconsin—Madison and MSU IDEA at Michigan State University. These programs provide special incentives to departments, like specially funded positions, to hire qualified faculty of color.

A second approach is the creation of a **consortium** where a group of institutions combine their resources to hire staff with expertise in teacher education for diversity to provide part of the teacher education program, usually field experiences and a few courses and seminars related to teaching for cultural diversity. One of our case study sites, the Urban Education Program in Chicago, employs four faculty not directly associated with any of the member colleges whose expertise is in teacher education for diversity. This program, which has existed since the fall of 1963, has provided courses in multicultural education and in instruction for limited English proficient students and school and community experiences to hundreds of prospective teachers from small liberal arts colleges which were unable by themselves to offer these experiences.

Our research discovered two other consortia focusing on teacher education for diversity, the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program (CUTE) which currently involves approximately 20 colleges and universities in 6 states. This program began in 1967 and is based on an earlier program at Central Missouri State College. CUTE has graduated over 2,000 teachers and, during the 1970s, was adopted by other institutions across the country (McCormick 1990).

Another cooperative arrangement, involving eight colleges, is the Urban Education Semester of the Venture Consortium coordinated by Bank Street College in New York City. This urban educational experience for college juniors, who have not necessarily made a commitment to a career in teaching, involves interdisciplinary course work at Bank Street and field experiences in East Harlem schools (Levine and Pignatelli 1994).

All three of these consortia provide preparation for teaching in urban schools to students from colleges without the faculty or schools to implement their own intensive cross-cultural teacher education program.

A third approach to the institutional aspects of the problem of teacher education for diversity involves the provision of systematic **staff development for teacher education faculty**. This approach helps faculty learn about various aspects of teacher education for diversity and how to incorporate it into their institutions and programs. For example, The Multicultural Education Infusion Center at San Diego State University in California with funding from the U.S. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Affairs, provided a two-week intensive institute in June 1993 to teams of faculty from 15 teacher education institutions. A follow-up network experience was designed to increase the capability of these institutions to prepare teachers for work with diverse students (Pang 1993).

The Association of Teacher Educators and George Mason University, also with funding from the U.S. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, have been offering a series of three-day institutes across the country for school and university teacher educators. These institutes are designed to encourage teacher educators to give more explicit attention to language-related issues in the preparation of all teachers.

A fourth approach to the institutional aspects of teacher education for diversity is **partnership** agreements between predominantly white teacher education institutions and other colleges or universities with significant numbers of faculty and students of color or schools and school districts in areas with large numbers of ethnic- or linguistic-minority students. This approach was exemplified in the 1970s by the partnership between Louisiana Tech, a formerly white segregated institution, and Grambling State University, an historically Black institution, which shared a common geographical area (Mills 1984). Another form of partnership to enhance the capacity of a teacher education program to prepare teachers to teach diverse students is one between a teacher education program located in a predominately white area and K-12 schools and school districts which would provide teacher education students with field placements in schools serving students of color. The American Indian and Latino Immersion Projects coordinated by Jim Mahan at Indiana University in Bloomington (Mahan 1982) and the partnership between Moorhead University in Minnesota and the San Juan-Alamo School District in South Texas

(Cooper, Beare, and Thorman 1990) are examples of these school-university partner ships.

Promising Approaches: A Cautionary Note

Although these four approaches to the institutional dimension of the task of teacher education for diversity all have some promise in their own right and in specifically addressing the proposed NCATE refinements in standards related to multicultural education, they all have their particular problems. **The recruitment and retention of faculty of color in largely white institutions is both a critical need and a moral responsibility, but opportunities for such practices are clearly limited.** Despite specific institutional policies to recruit faculty of color, higher education in the U. S. is currently subject to severe financial restrictions, and recruitment of any new faculty is the subject of intense scrutiny.

In addition, white institutions with few faculty of color often offer little more than inhospitable environments for new faculty of color and especially for those who come with expressed commitments to address issues of diversity. There is often the assumption that issues of diversity should be "their" concern and not the concern of the entire faculty. There is also the perception that faculty of color have few, if any, "mainstream" interests and are often automatically relegated to limited roles and responsibilities in ed schools, finding themselves marginalized at best. While seemingly well-intended, many of these recruitment policies fail to provide opportunities for all faculty to learn from the variety of perspectives on a number of educational issues which faculty of color bring to white institutions.

Further, the practice of teacher education is not highly valued within academe generally, and most college and university norms and reward structures neither reward teaching nor provide the kind of incentives needed to sustain programmatic efforts of faculty to bring about the kind of personal and professional transformation of teacher education students needed (Liston and Zeichner 1991). Promotion and tenure decisions still depend heavily on criteria related to research and scholarship, and faculty who devote large amounts of their time to teaching and teacher education program development have little time to spend on activities which are necessary for academic success.

Some of these same problems point to shortcomings in the staff development approach which exports a small group of faculty to another location and then returns them to an unchanged environment in which they are expected to shoulder the burden for teacher education for diversity. Without a concerted effort to create a culturally diverse learning community and programmatic and personnel practices committed to the promotion of diversity and equity in all parts of the programs and the culture within the teacher education institution, there is little hope for widespread success of either of these two approaches.

The consortium approach also relegates concerns about diversity to "them" rather than to "us." While the Chicago program, for example, has documented numerous successes with individual students over its nearly thirty-year history and provides teacher education expertise unavailable on the home campuses of students, it nonetheless largely segregates (with some exceptions) teacher education for diversity to the experiences students have outside of their home institutions. Although the 15-member colleges are geographically unable to provide field experiences in diverse settings for their students, and while we know of a few faculty in these colleges who care deeply about issues of diversity and equity, the fact remains that these concerns are not treated systematically in the students' liberal education. Yet as Bok (1986) has noted, a liberal education should include

> [the development of] an awareness of other cultures with their differing values, traditions, and institutions. By having the chance to explore many opportunities, they should acquire lasting intellectual and cultural interests, [and] gain in self-knowledge. . . .Through working and living with a wide variety of fellow students, they should achieve greater social maturity and acquire a tolerance of human diversity (pp. 54-55).

Quite simply, teacher education for diversity is the responsibility of the total institution. While consortia can provide special opportunities for students that home institutions might be unable to provide, the home institutions should not abdicate their responsibilities for the full scope of a student's liberal education on the road to becoming a teacher.

The partnership approach also has limitations. Cooperative efforts between higher education institutions were more popular in the 1970s and 1980s than they are now, as a result of federal and state legislation and judicial decisions to desegregate racially separate colleges and universities and to restructure state systems in response to shrinking revenues. Although some such partnerships remain, the lessons learned from prior efforts indicate that governments and courts cannot automatically legislate cooperation between institutions, and especially those that have historically been unequal. Success of these efforts demands a commonly desired goal in the education of teachers, a sense of shared responsibility, an acknowledgment of shared expertise, the "creation of a climate of mutual trust and cooperation, and a willingness to break with tradition by combining and reorganizing existing resources" (Mills 1984, pp. 22-23).

Conclusion. Although we have pointed out both strengths and shortcomings from our preliminary findings, over the next year and a half as we continue our research, we hope to provide further and more detailed evidence of the success of efforts in which teacher educators are currently engaged. In particular, little is actually known about the lived reality of teacher educators in attempting to address diversity with their students or about how teacher candidates interpret and give meaning to attempts to influence them in particular ways. Although the faculty in our case study sites and some other teacher educators elsewhere can demonstrate immediate influence of their efforts through prospective teachers' self-reports, **there is no convincing evidence in the literature related to the long-term impact of these strategies on teachers and their practices or on teacher education institutions and their faculties. We hope that our observations and interviews of faculty, current students, and program graduates and consideration of the positive aspects of institutional arrangements will provide evidence pointing to directions for meaningful and effective program change to better prepare teachers to teach everyone's children**. Without such change, we will continue to fail to keep our social contract to educate **all** children to high academic standards.

Note

1. While our focus is mainly on the preparation of white teachers to teach poor students of color because of demographic characteristics, we are not assuming that teachers who are members of a minority group can necessarily translate their cultural knowledge into culturally relevant pedagogy (Montecinos, in press). We are also not saying that it is unimportant to continue to try to recruit more people of color into teaching. These efforts are extremely important, but even under the most optimistic scenario for their success, the problem of educating teachers for diversity in the United States will largely continue to be one of educating culturally encapsulated and monolingual white teachers to teach many poor students of color. Finally, we are also not saying that multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching is only important for poor students of color. Multicultural education, culturally responsive pedagogy, and the intercultural competence of teachers are important issues in all schools and for all teachers. Our study focuses on a small aspect of a much larger issue.

References

Ahlquist, R. 1992. Manifestations of inequality: Overcoming resistance in a multicultural foundations course. In *Research and multicultural education* (89-105). Edited by C. Grant. London: Falmer Press.

Beyer, L. 1991. Teacher education, reflective inquiry and moral action. In Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education (113-29). Edited by B. R. Tabachnick and K. Zeichner. Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Bok, D. 1986. *Higher learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cooper, A., P. Beare, and J. Thorman. 1990. Preparing teachers for diversity: A comparison of student teaching experiences in Minnesota & South Texas. *Action in Teacher Education* 12(3): 1-4.

Ducharme, E., and R. Agne. 1989. Professors of education: Uneasy residents of academe. In *The professors of teaching* (67-86). Edited by R. Wisniewski and E. Ducharme. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Ellwood, C. 1990. The moral imperative of ethnic studies in urban teacher education programs. In *Proceedings of the fourth national forum of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education* (1-6). Edited by M. Diez. Milwaukee: Alverno College.

Gallagher, P. 1993. Teachers-cultural assumptions: A hidden dimension of school teaching. Paper presented in Atlanta at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Gay, G. 1986. Multicultural teacher education. In *Multicultural education in western societies* (154-77). Edited by J. Banks and J. Lynch. New York: Praeger.

Gollnick, D. 1992. Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In *Research & multicultural education* (218-39). Edited by C. Grant. London: Falmer Press.

Gomez, M. L. In press. Teacher education reform and prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching other people's children. In *Teaching & teacher education*.

Gomez, M., and B. R. Tabachnick. 1991. Preparing preservice teachers to teach diverse learners. Paper presented in Chicago at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Goodlad, J. 1990. *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Grant, C. 1993. The multicultural preparation of U.S. teachers: Some hard truths. In *Inequality and teacher education*. Edited by G. Verma. London: Falmer Press.

Grant, C., and W. Secada. 1990. Preparing teachers for diversity. In *Handbook of research on teacher education* (403-22). Edited by W. R. Houston. New York: Macmillan.

Haberman, M. 1987. *Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Institute for Urban and Minority Education.

___. 1991. The rationale for training adults as teachers. In *Empowerment through multicultural education* (275-86). Edited by C. Sleeter. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Haberman, M., and L. Post. 1992. Does direct experience change education students' perceptions of low-income minority children? *Midwestern Educational Researcher* 5(2): 29-31.

Hixson, J. 1992. Multicultural issues in teacher education: Meeting the challenge of student diversity. In *Toward education that is multicultural: Proceedings of the first annual meeting of the National Association for Multicultural Education* (139-47). Edited by C. Grant. New York: Silver Burdett.

Hollins, E. 1990. Debunking the myth of a monolithic white American culture; or moving toward conclusion. *American Behavioral Scientist* 34(2): 201-09.

Iazetto, D., S. Russell. 1994. Community field experiences in the Urban Education Program. In *The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity*. Edited by K. Zeichner and S. Melnick. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

King, J., and G. Ladson-Billings. 1990. The teacher education challenge in elite university settings: Developing critical perspectives for teaching in a democratic & multicultural society. *European Journal of Intercultural Studies* 1(2): 15-30.

Kleinfeld, J. 1989. *Teaching taboo-topics: The special virtues of the case method*. Fairbanks: College of Rural Alaska.

Kushner, K., and R. Brislin. 1986. Bridging gaps: Cross-cultural training in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* : 51-54.

Levine, L., and F. Pignatelli. 1994. Imagining change through ethnographic inquiry. Paper presented in New Orleans at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Liston, D., and K. Zeichner. 1991. *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York: Routledge.

Mahan, J. 1982. Native Americans as teacher trainers: Anatomy and outcomes of a cultural immersion project. *Journal of Educational Equity & Leadership* 2(2): 100-10.

___. 1993. Native Americans as non-traditional, usually unrecognized, influential teacher educators. Paper presented in Los Angeles at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators.

McCormick, T. 1990. Collaboration works: Preparing teachers for urban realities. *Contemporary Education* 61(3): 129-34.

Mills, J. 1984. Addressing the separate but equal predicament in teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education* 35(6): 18-23.

Montecinos, C. In press. Multicultural teacher education for a culturally diverse teaching force. In *Practicing what we preach: Confronting diversity in teacher education*. Edited by R. Martin. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. 1993. Proposed refinement of NCATE's standards for the accreditation of professional education units. Photocopy.

Nieto, S. 1992. *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.

Noordhoff, K., and J. Kleinfeld. 1993. Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Teaching & Teacher Education* 9(1): 27-40.

Ongtooguk, P. 1994. Community field experiences in the Teachers for Alaska Program. In *The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity*. Edited by K. Zeichner and S. Melnick. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Training.

Paine, L. 1989. *Orientation towards diversity: What do prospective teachers bring?* Research Report 89-9. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Pang, V. 1993. Personal communication. April.

Ross, D., J. Johnson, and W. Smith. 1991. Helping preservice teachers confront issues related to education equity: Assessing revisions in coursework and fieldwork. Paper presented in Chicago at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Shulman, J. 1992. Tender feelings, hidden thoughts: Confronting bias, innocence & racism through case discussions. Paper presented in San Francisco at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Shulman, J., and A. Mesa-Bains. 1990. *Teaching diverse students: Cases & commentaries*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research & Development.

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. 1976. *Teacher education in the U.S.: The responsibility gap*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Villegas, A. M. 1993. Restructuring teacher education for diversity: The innovative curriculum. Paper presented in Atlanta at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Willison, S. 1994. Community field experiences in the American Indian Project. In *The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity*. Edited by K. Zeichner and S. Melnick. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Wise, A. E. 1993. Draft of the refinement of NCATE professional accreditation standards. Memorandum. June.

Zeichner, K. 1993. *Educating teachers for cultural diversity*. Special Report. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

___. In press. Preparing teachers for cross-cultural teaching. In *Toward a common destiny: Race and ethnic relations in American schools*. Edited by W. Hawley and A. Jackson. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Zeichner, K., and J. Gore. 1990. Teacher socialization. In *Handbook for research on teacher education* (329-48). Edited by W. R. Houston. New York: Macmillan.

Zeichner, K., and K. Hoeft. In press. Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In *Handbook of research on teacher education*. 2nd ed. Edited by J. Sikula. New York: Macmillan.

Zimpher, N., and E. Ashburn. 1992. Countering parochialism among teacher candidates. In *Diversity in teacher education*. Edited by M. Dillworth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.